AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 1. Fig. 1 has been amended to include reference numeral 10.

Attachment: Replacement sheet

REMARKS

Claims 1-17, 37-59, and 67-80 are pending in the application. Fig. 1 is objected to. Claims 18-36, 60-66, and 82-84 are withdrawn as being drawn to a non-elected invention pursuant to the election without traverse of June 16, 2006. Claims 1-17, 37-59, and 67-80 are also provisionally rejected by obviousness type double patenting. Claims 1-17, 37-59, and 67-80 are further rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,324,541 to de l'Etraz in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,003,546 to Cheah (hereinafter "Cheah"). Claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 37-40, 44, 52, 54, 67, 69 are amended. Support for the amended claims may be found at pages 20-24 and 26 of the specification. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, the applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

I.   Drawings Objection

Fig. 1 is amended to include an information network, item 10, as disclosed at paragraph [0024], lines 1 and 2, and illustrated in the attached Replacement Sheet. It is believed that the objection to Fig. 1 should now be withdrawn.

II.   Obviousness Type Double Patenting Provisional Rejections of Claims 1-17, 37-59, and 67-80

It is alleged in the Office action that claims 1-17, 37-59, and 67-80 of the present application are an obvious variation of the claims pending in U.S. Patent Application No. 10/876,236 and claims 1-17, 37-59, and 67-80 are provisionally rejected. Because the claims are provisionally rejected, the applicants choose not to respond to these rejections until the claims of the 10/876,236 application actually issue or become allowed.

III.   Rejection of claims 1-17, 37-59, and 67-80 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Office action must show that the prior art references, when combined, teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. Because no combination of any cited reference teaches or suggests the subject matter of amended claims 1, 37, 54, and 67, the proposed combination of references make the requisite *prima facie* showing. The rejections under § 103(a) should thus be withdrawn.

A.   **Independent Claims 1 and 37:**

Cheah does not disclose the administration routine of amended claims 1 and 37.
Cheah generally discloses updating previously-exchanged personal contact information
between an individual "registered user" and an individual "requesting user" wherein the
requesting user is also a registered user. Cheah, Col. 3, lines 3-14. To maintain current
system contact information, the update processing disclosed by Cheah exchanges updated
contact data between parties to a previous exchange. Id., Col. 25, lines 2-8. The updated
data is first saved to a server, then sent from the server to the original requestor. Id., Col. 24,
lines 64-67. Upon notification and approval by the previous requestor, the updates are sent
and saved at each individual requestor's local machine. Id., Col. 25, lines 45-47.

As disclosed by Cheah, the update occurs between the registered user and the
requesting user as "[t]he contact information being exchanged pertains to the parties
participating in a particular exchange." Id., Col. 9, lines 36-37. To perform an update, a
registered user "alter[s] their contact information" at either a "client-side application" or a
user-accessed website which the disclosed system then uses to perform "automatic contact
information distribution processing." Id., Col. 9, lines 45-57. The system then saves the
altered or new data to a server and "distribute[s] the altered content information... to all of
those requestor machines that previously received... the contact information which is now
outdated." Id., Col. 30, lines 43-53. After the registered user updates his personal data, "the
previously exchanged contact information is electronically updated to be consistent with the
altered contact information." Id., Col. 9, lines 60-61. In another embodiment, Cheah
discloses that the server "send[s] an update notification to the client-application of the local
machine [to inform the user] that there are update profiles to be delivered. This approach
allows the user to decide if and when the updated user profiles are to be sent." Id., Col. 25,
lines 53-57.

In contrast, amended claim 1 recites two databases, each containing a first and second
contact file, respectively, that share common data, and an administration routine for
managing changes to the common data. Amended claim 37 recites a single database
including first contact files within a user collection and second contact files within a firm
collection "wherein each of the multiplicity of second contact files within the firm collection
has data associated with one of the contacts for which a first contact file exists within at least

- 14 -

one of the plurality of user collections." Upon detecting a change to the common data, the administration routine recited in amended claims 1 and 37 "send[s] a message including the change to a data administrator interface..." and, in response to the message, "at least one of approve[s], reject[s], or follow[s] up on the change from the data administrator interface...." Further, upon approval at the administrator interface, the administration routine recited in amended claims 1 and 37 "make[s] the change to the common data of the corresponding second contact file within the firm collection...." The administration routine recited in amended claim 1 also "make[s] the change to the common data of the remaining user collections."

The system disclosed by Cheah processes subsequent updates to previously-exchanged contact data by sending a notice to one of the parties to the original request. The previous requestor then saves the update locally. This system disclosed by Cheah is quite different from the claimed system that, upon notice to and approval from "an administrator interface," saves the updated contact data to a central "firm collection" as recited by amended claims 1 and 37. In further contrast to the disclosure of Cheah, amended claims 1 and 37 recite sending notice of the update to an "administrator interface" as opposed to sending notice to one or more parties to a previous contact data exchange. Also, after an "approval," Cheah saves the update at each local machine, rather than "mak[ing] the change to the common data...within the firm collection" as recited in amended claims 1 and 37. Because Cheah does not disclose "send[ing] a message including the change to a data administrator interface..., at least one of approv[ing], reject[ing], or follow[ing] up on the change at the... interface..., [or] mak[ing] the change to the common data of the corresponding second contact file within the firm collection..." as recited, Cheah does not disclose the administration routine of amended claims 1 and 37. Further, no other cited reference discloses the administration routine as recited in amended claims 1 and 37. Therefore, Cheah alone or in combination with any other reference, does not disclose the inventions recited in amended claims 1 and 37, and all claims dependent therefrom.

B.   Independent Claim 54:

Cheah does not disclose the administration routine as recited in amended claim 54. As previously discussed, Cheah discloses processing subsequent updates to previously-

exchanged contact data by <u>sending a notice to one of the parties to the original request</u> of changed data saved on a server. The previous requestor then saves the updates locally. In contrast, amended claim 54 recites "an administration routine [that is] "adapted to provide <u>a</u> <u>message to a firm administrator including the detected change</u> made to one of the contact files... wherein <u>approving the change prompts the administration routine to make the change</u> <u>to the data in common with the corresponding first contact file</u>." Cheah discloses neither "sending a message to a firm administrator including the change" nor an approval of the change that prompts "mak[ing] the change to the data in common with the corresponding first contact file" as recited in amended claim 54. Further, no other cited reference discloses the administration routine as recited in amended claim 54. Therefore, Cheah alone or in combination with any other reference, does not teach or suggest the inventions recited in amended claim 54, and all claims dependent therefrom.

C.   Independent Claim 67:

Cheah also does not disclose the administration routine and message interaction with an administrator as recited in amended claim 67. As previously discussed, Cheah discloses processing subsequent updates to previously-exchanged contact data by <u>sending a notice to</u> <u>one of the parties to the original request</u> of changed data saved on a server. The previous requestor then saves the updates locally. Amended claim 67 recites, among other things, that "the first database provides <u>a message to the administration routine</u> reflecting the nature of the change made to the at least one contact file associated with the particular contact within the first user collection" and "<u>in response to the message to the administration routine, the</u> <u>administration routine provides a message to a firm administrator</u> reflecting the nature of the change made to the at least one contact file associated with the particular contact within the first user collection." Further, amended claim 67 recites that, upon the firm administrator accepting the change based on the nature of the change, "the administration routine makes a corresponding change to the duplicate contact file... within the firm collection" and "the administration routine makes the corresponding change to the particular contact within the second user collection." Cheah discloses neither the administration routine nor providing messages from a database to the routine and a firm administrator to assist the contact information update as recited in amended claim 67. Further, no other cited reference

discloses the inventions recited in amended claim 67. Therefore, Cheah alone or in combination with any other reference, does not disclose amended claim 67, and all claims dependent therefrom.

IV. Conclusion

Because Cheah does not disclose the administration routine as recited in amended claims 1, 37, and 54, or the routine and message interaction as recited in amended claim 67, the applicant submits that the application as a whole is in a condition for allowance, and such action is requested at the examiner's earliest opportunity. The examiner is encouraged to contact the applicant's undersigned attorney with any questions regarding this response or the application as a whole at the telephone number indicated below. If there are any additional fees or refunds required, the Commissioner is directed to charge or debit Deposit Account No. 13-2855.

Dated: January 3, 2007   Respectfully submitted,

                                                By_____
                                                Randall G. Rueth
                                                   Registration No.: 45,887
                                                MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
                                                233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300
                                                Sears Tower
                                                Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357
                                                (312) 474-6300
                                                Attorney for Applicant